



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that the bread which we break is the partaking of the body of Christ; and also do graunt, hym that eateth of that bread, and drinketh of that cup unworthely, to be guiltie of the Lorde's death, and to eat and drink his own damnation, because he esteemeth not the Lorde's body, &c.

"Thus, then, hetherto yet, we all agree. But now let see wherein the dissention doth stande.

"It is neither to be denied nor dissembled, that in the matter of this sacrament there be divers pointes, wherein men counted to be learned cannot agree—as, Whether there be any transubstantiation of the bread, or no? Any corporall and carnal presence of Christe's substance, or no? Whether adoration, only due unto God, is to be done to the sacrament, or no? And whether Christe's body be there offered indeed unto the Heavenly Father by the priest, or no? Or whether the evyll man receyveth the natural body of Christ, or no? Yet, nevertheless, as in a man diseased in divers partes, commonly the original cause of such divers diseases, which is spread abroad in the body do come from one chief member, as from the stomacke, or from the head: even so all these five aforesaid poyntes do chiefly hang upon this one question, which is, What is the matter of the sacrament? whether it is the natural substance of bread, or the natural substance of Christe's owne body? The truth of this question, truly tried out and agreed upon, no doubt shall cause the controversie in all to rest. For if it bee Christe's owne natural body, born of the Virgin, then assuredly (seeing all learned men in England, so far as I know, both new and old, graunt there is but one substance), then, I say, they must need graunt Transubstantiation—that is, a change of the substance of bread into the substance of Christe's body; then, also, they must graunt the carnal and corporal presence of Christe's body; then must the sacrament be adored with the honour due unto Christe himself, for the unitie of the two natures in one person; then if the priest do offer the sacrament, he doth offer indeede Christe himself; and, finally, the murderer, the adulterer, or wicked man, receyvynge the sacrament, must needs there receive also the natural substance of Christe's owne blessed body, flesh and blood.

"Now, on the other side, if, after the truth shall be truly tried out, it be founde that the substance of bread is the natural substance of the sacrament, although, for the change of the use, office and dignity of the bread, the bread, indeed, is sacramentally changed into the body of Christe, as the water in baptism is sacramentally chaunged into the fountaine of regeneration, and yet, the natural substance thereof remaineth all one, as it was before; if, I say, the true solution of that former question, whereupon all these controversies do hang, be, that the natural substance of bread is the material substance of the sacrament of Christe's blessed body, then must it needes follow of the former proposition (confessed of all that be named to be learned, so farre as I do know, in England), which is, that there is but one material substance in the sacrament of the body, and one only likewise in the sacrament of the blood—that there is no such thing, in deede, and in truth, as they call transubstantiation; for the substance of the bread remaineth still in the sacrament of the body; then, also, the natural substance of Christe's human nature, which he took of the Virgin Mary, is in heaven, where it reigneth now in glory, and not there enclosed under the form of bread; then that godly honour, which is only due unto God the Creator, and may not be done unto the creature, without idolatrye and sacrilege, is not to be done unto the sacrament; then, also, the wicked, I meane the impenitent murderer, adulterer, or such lyke, do not receive the natural substance of the blessed body and blood of Christe: finally, then doth it follow, that Christe's blessed body and blood, which was once only offered, and shed upon the cross, beyng available for the synnes of all the whole world, is offered up no more in the natural substance thereof, neither by the priest nor any other thing.

"Now, then, you will say, What kind of Presence do they graunt? and what do they deny? Briefly, they denie the presence of Christe's body in the natural substance of his human and assumpt nature, and graunt the presence of the same by grace—that is, they affirme and saye, that the substance of the natural body and blood of Christe, is only remaining in heaven, and so shall be unto the later day, when he shall come agayne in glory, accompanied with the angels of heaven, to judge both the quicke and the dead. And the same natural substance of the very body and blood of Christe because it is united unto the divine nature, in Christe, the second person in the Trinitie; therefore, it hath not only life in itself, but is also able to give, and doth give, life unto as many as be, or shall be partakers thereof; even, as for example, we saye, the same sunne, which in substance never removeth his place out of the heavens, is yet present hereby by his beames, light, and natural influence, where it shineth upon the earth; for God's Word and his sacraments be, as it were, the beames of Christ, which is "sol justitie"—the sun of Righteousnesse."—*Vide Ep. Ridley's Treatise on the Lord's Supper.*

"As for us," saith Bishop Cosin, "we all openly profess, with St. Bernard, that the presence of the body of Christ, in the sacrament, is spiritual, and, therefore,

true and real; and with the same Bernard, and all the ancients, we deny that the body of Christ is either carnally present or given. The thing we willingly admit, but humbly and religiously forbear to inquire into the manner."

Had the Romish maintainers of transubstantiation done the same, they would not have determined and decreed, and then have imposed, as an article of faith, absolutely necessary to salvation, a manner of presence, newly by them invented, under pain of the most direful curse, and there would have been, in the Church, less wrangling, and more peace and unity.

A. C. T.

AUTHORIZED STATEMENTS ON THE NATURE AND KIND OF PUNISHMENTS IN PURGATORY.

SIR—I want to know if the following passage fairly represents the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church about Purgatory; and I hope you will give me an answer, or get it for me, in your paper, as I want particularly to know if it is correct:—

"When life is fled with the last light, still neither every evil nor all corporeal suffering departs from the wretched beings. It is inevitable, that many things that have, for a long time, cleaved to them, should have grown into them in a wonderful manner; therefore, they are grieved with torture, and suffer the punishment of their former sins. Some are spread out, hung up to the winds: the stain of guilt is washed out of others in a deep whirlpool, or burned out with fire. Each suffers his proper expiation. At length we are conveyed into the spacious paradise, and a few of us possess the habitations of joy, when a long time has taken out the stain that was contracted."

I hope, sir, that you will be able to tell me whether this statement of Purgatory be correct, and authorized.

Yours, &c.,

A CONSTANT READER.

We think the above passage gives a fair statement of the doctrine of Purgatory, as now commonly held by Roman Catholics. At the same time, we are bound to say, that the passage is not an authorized statement of the doctrine of the Church of Rome.

We give here such statements as are authorized, in order that our readers may compare the two. The only really authorized statement we know of, as to the nature of the sufferings in Purgatory, is in the Catechism of the Council of Trent:—"The fire of Purgatory, in which the souls of just men are cleansed by a temporary punishment, in order to be admitted into their eternal country, into which nothing defiled entereth"—p. 59. Again—"Those who require to be freed from the stains of sin, or die indebted to the Divine justice, are purified in the fire of Purgatory"—p. 61.

These are authorized statements of what the Church of Rome believes about Purgatory.

Now, on comparing the passage which "A Constant Reader" has brought forward, it will be seen at once that it agrees exactly with these authorized statements—1st, as to the purpose for which souls are sent to Purgatory—viz., to have the stains of sin purged out; 2nd, as to the efficiency of torture in effecting that cleansing; and 3rd, that fire is employed to accomplish this object. They differ in this: that the passage produced by the reader speaks of other tortures being also employed for the same purpose, such as bleaching the souls in the winds, and steeping them in a whirlpool. The Council of Trent says nothing of these punishments; but the difference is not irreconcilable, because the Catechism does not say that fire only is employed. We do not know of any authorized statement of the Church of Rome that other punishments are employed; but we believe it is left at liberty for persons to believe that other punishments are used. Thus, when some of the Greek Church, at the Council of Florence, A.D., 1439, agreed for the first time to believe in Purgatory (which confession the Greek Church disavowed), they did it in these words—"The middle sort of souls were in a place of punishment; but whether that were fire, or darkness and tempest, or something else, they would not contend."—Sess. 25. This was accepted, and so the formal instrument of agreement was drawn up—"their souls are purged after death, with purgatorial punishments"—without saying exactly what punishments. There are also many books, published by Roman Catholic authors of credit in their own church, which affirm that bleaching and steeping are used in Purgatory. These may be found in the *Speculum Exemplorum*, printed at Douay, A.D., 1603.

The passage which our Reader brings forward is, therefore, quite agreeable, in the main, to the authorized statements of the Church of Rome; and when it goes beyond those authorized statements, in some lesser details, it is only what Roman Catholics are allowed by their church, and what we believe they commonly do hold.

But while we say this we are bound also to say, that that passage which the Reader quotes is not an authorized statement of the doctrine of the Church of Rome: for this reason, it is actually a statement of the doctrine of the heathen religion. In fact, that passage was written by a heathen poet, Virgilius Maro, (*Æn. vi. 735*), before the birth of Christ, and of course before the Ca-

tholic Church or the Catholic religion were in existence. It is, therefore, a statement of the doctrines of the heathen religion, and not of the Christian religion.

It does certainly seem very strange that a statement made by a heathen, of the doctrines of the heathen religion, the religion of false gods, should serve so exactly to express the doctrines of the Church of Rome now. How can this be accounted for? Cardinal Bellarmine tries to account for it by saying that Virgil learned this much truth from the light of reason itself.—*De Purgat. lib. i., cap. 11, p. 612, Colon.* But, then, it seems strange that the light of reason should have taught this heathen nothing of the true God, not even that God is one. And, besides this, though the Church of Rome considers it quite true to believe now what Virgil wrote then, yet that Church considers it quite false for him to have believed a great part of it then! For Virgil believed not only that Purgatory was then in existence, but that the actual deliverance of souls from Purgatory was then actually taking place. The Church of Rome believes that Purgatory was then in existence, but holds, also, that there was no deliverance out of Purgatory until Christ descended there, "to liberate from suffering the holy and the just who were held in painful captivity."—*Catechism of Trent, p. 60.* It is clear, therefore, that Virgil was wrong in holding what he did at that time, though the Church of Rome thinks herself right in holding the same doctrine now.

We, therefore, do not see how the exact resemblance of the heathen religion and the religion of the Church of Rome, in this doctrine, can be accounted for. Protestants say that this is a heathen doctrine, that the early Church rejected it as such, and that the Church of Rome, in later times, copied it (like other things, such as the use of incense in sacrifices, images in worship, &c.), from the heathens.

This would certainly account for the exact resemblance between the two. If any other way of accounting for it can be suggested, we will be ready to publish it.

ON LADY DAY AND GOOD FRIDAY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have read, in the last number of the CATHOLIC LAYMAN, the letter of Peter Brannigan, of Meath, on the observance of Good Friday and Lady Day, together with your remarks upon it.

I have myself been very much surprised at finding that the 25th of March this year was, as your correspondent expresses it, "no day at all" among the Roman Catholics, as, although long since aware that it was contrary to the practice of the priests of the Church of Rome to celebrate Mass on Good Friday, I could scarcely believe it possible that it would be thought right to disregard so high a festival as Lady Day, merely because it fell on the anniversary of the crucifixion. I thought it was most likely that the same relaxation of discipline would be allowed, as in the case of Christmas day falling on a Friday, in which case you are aware that no fast is required.

I find, however, that in the case under consideration a different expedient was had recourse to (at least in this county—Limerick)—viz., to celebrate Lady Day on the Monday week following, while the real festival was rigidly observed as a black fast.

I am not able to give you any authority for the "strange rule" which forbids the priest to celebrate Mass on Good Friday, but I have long been aware that such a rule was in existence. I have, however, lately heard a very strange reason given for this rule. I have been told that it is because no priest is allowed to drink wine on that day. Now, sir, if this really be the reason of the rule, I would ask some of your Roman Catholic correspondents to inform me whether in the celebration of Mass, the priest drinks wine at all, as I have always understood it to be the faith of the Church of Rome that, after the words of consecration (and it is then that the priest drinks of the chalice) there is a total change of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, which change is called Transubstantiation.

If there be any truth in the doctrine of Transubstantiation I should think that the priest may without any breach of his abstinence, partake of the contents of the chalice, and if it contain the very blood of Christ, I know of no day during the whole ecclesiastical year which seems so appropriate for a participation of it as the anniversary of that day on which it flowed from the bleeding wounds of our crucified Redeemer.

I am sir, faithfully yours,

A. C.

ON I CORINTHIANS XI. 24.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Permit me to correct one or two inaccuracies into which your correspondent "Fontium Petitor" has fallen. The view of Transubstantiation against which he contends, was not "put by Catholics," but by you in the article on the Touchstone in your January number. Your words are—"If we understand these words in their literal sense, it is the cup and not the wine in it which is changed into blood." The sole object of my